DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 934 HE 003 052

AUTHOR Seagren, C. Donald
TITLE Differences in Perceived Institutional Functioning and Responsiveness to Change as Related to Faculty Types in Selected Four-Year Colleges.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ. of Pennsylvania.
PUB DATE 8 Mar 72
NOTE 34p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; *College Faculty; Educational Administration; *Educational Change; *Higher Education; Professors; Student Behavior; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This investigation is part of a larger exploratory study dealing with the response of 4-year colleges to student pressures for institutional change. This study deals with faculty perceptions and attitudes regarding: (1) the extent and nature of student pressures for institutional change; (2) the extent to and manner in which the institutions under study have responded to such pressures; and (3) the institutional functioning characteristics that appear to be significantly related to both student pressures and institutional responses. Specifically, this study deals with the following questions: (1) Do different types of faculty perceive differently various dimensions of institutional functioning? (2) Do different types of faculty perceive differently the responses of institutions to student pressures for change? (3) Are there differences between the institutions studied in terms of faculty perceptions of the dimensions of institutional functioning at their institutions? and (4) Are there differences between the institutions studied in terms of faculty perceptions of institutional responses to student pressures for change at their institutions? (Author)

ED 062 934

N-NPD
HE

"Differences in Perceived Institutional Functioning and Responsiveness to Change as Related to Faculty Types in Selected Four-Year Colleges"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 003 052

C. Donald Seagren
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, Pa. 15701
March 8, 1972

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Background: For a complete statement on the background and conceptual framework of this study, see Aurbach and Flexner, "Response of Four-Year Colleges to Student Pressures for Institutional Change," AERA presentation, March, 1972.

Purpose: This investigation is part of a larger exploratory study dealing with the response of four-year colleges to student pressures for institutional change, directed by Professors Herbert Aurbach and Hans Flexner, and sponsored by the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the Pennsylvania State University.

This study deals with faculty* perceptions and attitudes regarding: (1) the extent and nature of student pressures for institutional change; (2) the extent to and manner in which the institutions under study have responded to such pressures, and; (3) the institutional functioning characteristics that appear to be significantly related to both student pressures and institutional responses. Specifically this study deals with the following questions:

1. Do different types of faculty perceive differently various dimensions of institutional functioning?

2. Do different types of faculty perceive differently the responses of institutions to student pressures for change?

3. Are there differences between the institutions studied in terms of faculty perceptions of the dimensions of institutional functioning at their institutions?

4. Are there differences between the institutions studied in terms of faculty perceptions of institutional response to student pressures for change at their institutions?

Instruments: The concepts of faculty types, institutional functioning characteristics, and student pressures led to the use of the following instruments.

In order to deal with the diversity of perceptions among faculty, a typology was employed as a manageable research tool for dealing with faculty orientations. Based upon the work of Robert Merton, Alvin Gouldner, Burton Clark and others, the

---

*Student perceptions are analyzed in a companion study by Thomas J. Quatroche, "Differences in Perceived Institutional Functioning and Responsiveness to Change as Related to Student Types in Selected Four-Year Colleges."

directors of the larger study (Aurbach and Flexner) designed a Faculty Typology instrument. This instrument includes four faculty types (Local-Academic, Local-Vocational, Cosmopolitan-Academic, Cosmopolitan-Vocational) modified from those suggested by Clark in 1963, and two types (Advocate and Activist) included to identify faculty members who related their philosophical stances to their involvement in current societal issues. Faculty respondents to this instrument were asked to read descriptive statements of the six faculty orientations, and to rank the first three choices that best described their own personal orientations. They were then classified into types on the basis of their first choices.

As part of an extensive study of institutional change and reform in higher education, Earl J. McGrath and two of his Columbia University associates, JB Lon Hefferlin and Hans Flexner, contributed to the development of the concept of "institutional vitality." The term "institutional vitality" was eventually replaced by the more neutral term "institutional functioning," and resulted in the development, by Richard Peterson and others at the Educational Testing Service, of the Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI). This instrument includes eleven institutional functioning dimensions: Intellectual-Aesthetic Extracurriculum (IAE); Freedom (F), Human Diversity (HD); Concern for Improvement of Society (IS); Concern for Undergraduate Learning (UL); Democratic Governance (DG); Meeting Local Needs (MLN); Self-Study and Planning (SP); Concern for Advancing Knowledge (AK); Concern for Innovation (CI), and; Institutional Esprit (IE). These dimensions, in varying combinations, reflect an institution's functioning characteristics. The complete instrument is comprised of 132 items, responses to which yield scores on the eleven dimensions. Mean faculty scores for each of the dimensions were calculated for each of the three institutions and across the three institutions.

Student pressures for change and reform have been manifested in several different areas -- curricular and educational changes, changes dealing with the governance of the institutions, and changes which increase student autonomy, constitute three of the most

vital areas. In examining these aspects of change, this study was concerned with faculty perceptions of the kind and degree of student requests for change, and of the ways in which their institutions responded to such requests. To identify these perceptions, Aurbach and Flexner designed an instrument, the Student Perceptions of Institutional Response (SPIR). This instrument collects perceptions of both faculty and students regarding three hypothetical change situations, each of which serves as a specific case in one of three general areas -- curriculum, governance, and student life. Following each situation is a series of six questions that deal with: (1) the nature of the response (consideration); (2) the time taken to respond; (3) the extent of student and faculty participation in discussion; (4) the extent of student and faculty participation in decision-making; (5) the type of action by students necessary to get a decision, and; (6) the response of institutions to student actions (consequences). Means for each of the six questions were obtained by situations and by institution. Faculty responses were utilized in this study.

This investigation was, therefore, concerned with determining if relationships existed between the two independent variables, (1) faculty types and, (2) the three institutions, and the two dependent variables, (1) institutional functioning characteristics and, (2) student pressures for change and institutional responses.

Procedures: In the fall of 1970, questionnaires were administered to randomly selected members of the faculties of three colleges in Pennsylvania that were, in the opinion of trained observers, different from one another in respect to their settings, goals, methods or styles of attaining those goals, and their overall institutional "climates." "State" College, located in a rural area of nothern Pennsylvania, is a state-owned and supported institution predominately devoted to the undergraduate education of teachers. Most of its students are state residents and live on-campus. "Ivy" College, located in the suburbs of a large city, is a

private, academically selective institution with a strong liberal arts tradition and a geographically diverse, largely resident student body. "Coalton" College, located in another urban area, is a private liberal arts college which offers some pre-professional and vocational education. Many of its student commute from the surrounding area. Total response from usable questionnaires were: State, 182 faculty (a 91% response) Ivy, 43 faculty (a 58% response), and; Coalton, 102 faculty (a 56% response).

Mean faculty scores on the IFI and on the SPIR instruments were compared by faculty type and by institution to determine the nature and extent of any relationships which may have existed between the variables. Analyses of variance were also performed to discover if there were significant differences, by independent variable on the mean scores of the dependent variables. Data of a demographic nature were collected from the faculty respondents in order to describe the sample.

Findings: The demographic data, useful in observing the make-up of the sample, are included in Appendix I.

First-choice responses to the Faculty Typology instrument (See Appendix II-A) indicated that a majority of the respondents (187 or 57.2%) assigned themselves to Faculty Philosophy A (Local-Academic). Furthermore, the combination of Philosophy A and Philosophy C (Local-Vocational, 81 or 24.8%) accounted for fully 82% of the total responses. Further analysis of the response patterns revealed that at all three institutions responses to Philosophies E (Advocate) and F (Activist) were negligible, accounting for only 4.6% and 1.2% of the total responses respectively. However, it is interesting to note that when faculty second and third choices were combined with first choices, the standings changed. The Advocates (Philosophy E) moved from fifth place to replace the Cosmopolitan-Academics (Philosophy B) in the third highest place, and there was a general shift in the middle three places (See Appendix II-B).

Comparisons of mean faculty scores on the IFI-Intellectual-Aesthetic Extracurriculum dimension by type of faculty, by institution, and by type of faculty within institutions

were derived from Table 1 below.

Insert Table 1 here

The mean score differences between types of faculty on this dimension were inconsistent and were, we believe, masked by the lack of N in some of the cells. Differences between institutions on this dimension showed some slight variations between the scores for Ivy and Coalton. When comparisons were made by types within institutions, we noted substantial agreement among State respondents of all types, some slight differences among Ivy respondents, and substantial agreement among the Local-Academics, Local-Vocationals and Advocates at Coalton. Analyses of variance tests were performed to determine if there were significant differences between mean faculty scores on this dimension, by faculty type and by institution. Both of these independent variables showed significant differences between means at the .01 level on this dimension (See Appendix III).

The differences between mean scores by type of faculty on the IFI Freedom dimension (see Table 2 below) were inconsistent, and were, we believe, masked by the lack of N in some of the cells. Differences by institution varied considerably, with the Ivy faculty mean score almost five points higher than the next highest score at Coalton. Comparisons of mean scores by type of faculty within institutions revealed that at State and at Coalton, the Local-Academics and Local-Vocationals seemed to perceive their institutions as relatively at the same level on this dimension, while the mean faculty scores for the Local-Academics and Cosmopolitan-Academics at Ivy were both similar and very positive.

Insert Table 2 here

Analyses of variance tests on the means for this IFI dimension revealed significant differences at the .01 level both by type of faculty and by institution (See Appendix III).

Comparison of mean faculty scores on the IFI Human Diversity dimension by type of faculty reavealed that the differences were inconsistent (See Table 3 below) and were, we believe, masked by the lack of N in some of the cells. Analysis of mean scores by institution revealed that State and Coalton faculty rated their institutions within one-tenth of a point of each other, and that the Ivy faculty rated their institutions more positively than did the other two rate their institution on the dimension. Again, we found on this dimension similarity of mean scores of the Local-Academics and Local-Vocationals at State and at Coalton. We note a significant difference between the scores of Local-Academics and Cosmopolitan-Academics at Ivy.

Insert Table 3 here

Analyses of variance tests on the mean scores for this IFI dimension revealed significant differences at the .05 level by type of faculty and at the .01 level by institution (See Appendix III).

Comparison of mean faculty scores on the IFI Undergraduate Learning dimension by type of faculty indicated that the differences were inconsistent (See Table 4 below) and were, we believe, masked by the lack of N in some of the cells. Analysis of mean scores by institution revealed that once again Ivy faculty rated their institution as most positive, with Coalton as the next most positive and State as least positive. When the mean faculty scores on this dimension were compared by type of faculty within institutions, we noted that at State the Cosmopolitan-Vocationals joined with the Local-Academics and Local-Vocationals in similarly rating their institution. It should be pointed out that the most positive scores came from the Ivy faculty responses. And we noted that the Coalton faculty mean scores on this dimension were relatively higher than those at State. It is significant to point out that on this Undergraduate Learning dimension the mean Advocate score from Coalton was more positive than any of the scores at State.

Insert Table 4 here

Analyses of variance findings on the mean scores for the IFI-UL dimension revealed that there were significant differences at the .05 level by type of faculty and at the .01 level by institution (See Appendix III).

Comparisons of mean faculty scores on the IFI Improvement of Society dimension by type of faculty, by institution, and by type of faculty within institutions were derived from Table 5 below.

Insert Table 5 here

The mean score differences between types of faculty on this dimension were inconsistent and were, we believe, masked by the lack of N in some of the cells. There were some great differences between institutions on this dimension. Scores ranged from a mean institutional score of 7.6 for Ivy to a 3.8 for State. The Cosmopolitan-Academics at all three institutions ranked their institutions as least positive on this dimension. Analyses of variance tests revealed that there were significant mean score differences at the .01 level both by type of faculty and by institution on this dimension (See Appendix III).

Comparisons of mean faculty scores on the IFI Democratic Governance dimension by type of faculty revealed that again there were no consistent patterns of differences (See Table 6 below). By institution comparison revealed that the State and Coalton mean scores were relatively the same while Ivy's scores were significantly more positive. By type of faculty within institution analysis revealed relatively low scores of 1.5 and 2.8 respectively for the Cosmopolitan-Academics at State and Cosmopolitan-Vocationals at Coalton. The score of 7.3 for Advocates at Coalton was among the most positive at that institution, while the 10.6 score of the Local-Academics at Ivy was the most positive mean score on the entire dimension.

Insert Table 6 here

Analyses of variance tests revealed that there were significant differences between mean scores at the .01 level both by type of faculty and by institution on this dimension (See Appendix III).

Mean faculty scores on the IFI Meeting Local Needs dimension are reported in Table 7 below.

Insert Table 7 here

The inconsistencies in mean faculty scores as compared by type of faculty make these findings subject to some doubt. When compared by institution on the Meeting Local Needs dimension, these mean faculty scores were most revealing. They showed that the Coalton faculty, with a mean score of 9.2, perceived their institution much more positively than did the faculty at Ivy with a mean score of 2.1. Likewise the State faculty score, at 6.6, was much more positive than the Ivy score. Mean scores for types of faculty within institutions consistently reflected the levels of positiveness revealed in the above comparison of institutional scores, ranging from a 10.1 score for Local-Vocationals at Coalton to a 1.5 score for Cosmopolitan-Academics at Ivy. Analyses of variance tests revealed significant differences between means on this dimension at the .01 level both by type of faculty and by institution (See Appendix III).

On the IFI Self-Study and Planning dimension the mean scores by type of faculty again failed to show any consistent differences (See Table 8 below). By institution, the comparison of mean scores showed insignificant differences, with the Ivy faculty score only slightly less positive than the scores of the State and Coalton faculty. Comparison of scores by types of faculty within institutions showed that the Cosmopolitan-Academics at State and Coalton, and the Cosmopolitan-Vocationals at Coalton rated their institutions as least positive on this dimension.

Insert Table 8 here

Analyses of variance tests revealed that there were significant differences at the .01 level between means by type of faculty, and no significant differences by institution, on this dimension (See Appendix III).

Comparisons of mean faculty scores on the IFI Advancing Knowledge dimension by type of faculty, by institution, and by type of faculty within institutions were derived from Table 9 below.

Insert Table 9 here

Comparisons of mean scores by type of faculty were hindered by the lack of any consistency in these responses, and by the lack of N in some of the cells. By institution, however, some significant differences in mean scores were observed. The most positive mean score of 6.5 from Ivy faculty was immediately noted when compared with the least positive score of 3.5 from State faculty. Within institutions and by types of faculty, the responses of the Cosmopolitan-Academics and Cosmopolitan-Vocationals dominated the least positive scores. Analyses of variance tests revealed that there were no significant differences between means by type of faculty, and differences significant at the .01 level by institution on this dimension (See Appendix III).

Comparisons of mean faculty scores by type of faculty on the IFI Concern for Innovation dimension showed little consistency in these scores (See Table 10 below). By institution, comparison of mean faculty scores revealed some slight differences in faculty perceptions on this dimension. For example, Ivy faculty rated their institution (9.0) as only slightly more positive than did both State (6.7) and Coalton (7.1). Once again, we discovered some similar patterns when we analyzed the mean scores by types of faculty within institutions. Cosmopolitan-Academics at State and Coalton, and Cosmopolitan-Vocationals at Coalton again assigned the least positive scores to their institutions on this dimension.

Insert Table 10 here

The significance of differences between means on this dimension were tested, utilizing analyses of variance tests, by type of faculty and by institutions. In both cases we found the differences significant at the .01 level (See Appendix III).

Comparisons of mean faculty scores by type of faculty on the IFI Institutional Esprit dimension showed little consistency in the scores (See Table 11 below). By institution comparison of mean faculty scores revealed that Ivy faculty (10.0) and Coalton faculty (9.1) rated their institutions relatively the same on this dimension. The State faculty mean score of 7.7 was significantly lower. By types of faculty and <u>within</u> institutions, the mean score comparisons showed that the Cosmopolitan-Academics at State rated their institution (4.1) much less positively than did any other type of faculty at either of the other two institutions. The most positive score (10.8) on this dimension came from the Cosmopolitan-Academics at Ivy.

Insert Table 11 here

Analysis of variance tests revealed that there were no significant differences between means by type of faculty, and significant differences between means by type of faculty, and significant differences between means at the .01 level by institution on this dimension (See Appendix III).

Comparisons of mean faculty scores on the SPIR Consideration scale by type of faculty, by institution, and by types of faculty <u>within</u> institutions were derived from Table 12 below.

Insert Table 12 below

The mean score differences by type of faculty on this scale were inconsistent and, we believe, were masked by the lack of N in some of the cells. Differences between institutions were minimal, with Ivy scores only slightly more positive than those from State and Coalton. Comparison of mean scores by types of faculty and <u>within</u> institutions showed a similar pattern of little difference. The most

positive score of 3.2 came from Local-Academics at Ivy and the least positive score of 6.0 from Cosmopolitan-Vocationals at Coalton. Analyses of variance tests were utilized to test the significance of diff rences between means by type of faculty and by institutions. Results of these analyses revealed that there were no significant differences between means by type of faculty, and differences between means significant at the .01 level by institution (See Appendix III).

The comparison of mean faculty scores by type of faculty on the SPIR-Time scale showed little consistency (See Table 13 below). By institution, there were some differences which should be noted. The Ivy faculty perceived their institution more positively (5.2) than did the faculty at State (6.6) perceive their institution, and much more positively than did the faculty at Coalton (8.2) rate their institution. The scores ranked from the most positive of 5.3 from the Local-Academics at Ivy to the least positive of 9.9 from the Cosmopolitan-Academics at Coalton. In every type, the Coalton faculty mean scores were consistently less positive than all others of the same type.

Insert Table 13 here

Analysis of variance tests revealed that there were no significant differences between means by type of faculty, and differences significant at the .01 level by institution on this scale (See Appendix III).

Comparisons of mean faculty scores on the SPIR Participation in Discussion scale by type of faculty, by institution, and by type of faculty within institutions were derived from Table 14 below.

Insert Table 14 here

The comparison of mean faculty scores by type of faculty on this scale showed little consistency. By institution, there were some differences which must be noted.

The Ivy faculty score (3.5) was the most positive and the Coalton faculty score (6.3) the least positive. The Cosmopolitan-Academics at State and the Cosmopolitan-Vocationals at Coalton had the least positive scores of 8.5 and 8.6 respectively on this scale, and the Ivy Local-Academics had the most positive score of 3.4. Analyses of variance findings revealed that both by type of faculty and by institution the mean score differences were significant at the .01 level on this scale (See Appendix III).

On the SPIR Participation in Decision-Making scale, the mean score differences by type of faculty were inconsistent (See Table 15 below).

Insert Table 15 here

By institution, there were some slight differences between mean scores. The Ivy faculty mean score of 5.9 was the most positive, followed closely by the mean faculty score of 6.8 from State. The Coalton mean faculty score was only slightly less positive at 8.2. By types of faculty within institutions, the Cosmopolitan-Academics at State (9.3) and Coalton (9.6), and the Cosmopolitan-Vocationals at Coalton (10.8) dominated the least positive scores. Analysis of variance findings revealed that there were no significant differences between means by type of faculty, and differences significant at the .01 level by institution on this scale (See Appendix III).

On the SPIR Student Action scale, mean score differences by type of faculty were inconsistent (See Table 16 below).

Insert Table 16 here

By institution there were slight differences in the mean scores. The Ivy faculty mean score of 3.6 was the most positive, followed in order by the State faculty mean score of 4.6 and the Coalton faculty mean score of 5.4. The most apparent differences observed when mean scores were compared by types of faculty within institutions was

that the Coalton faculty in all types dominated the least positive scores on this scale. Analysis of variance findings indicated that there were no significant differences between means by type of faculty, and differences significant at the .01 level by institution on this scale (See Appendix III).

On the SPIR Consequences for Students scale, mean score differences by type of faculty were inconsistent (See Table 17 below).

Insert Table 17 here

By institution there were slight differences in the mean scores. The Ivy faculty mean score of 4.5 was most positive, followed closely by the State faculty mean score of 6.0 and the Coalton faculty mean score of 6.4. The State Cosmopolitan-Academic mean score of 7.1 and the Coalton Cosmopolitan-Vocational mean score of 7.2 were the least positive on this scale, and the Ivy Local-Academic score of 4.2 the most positive. Analysis of variance findings revealed that there were no significant differences between means by type of faculty, and differences significant at the .01 level by institution on this scale (See Appendix III).

Summary and Conclusion: Comparison of mean faculty IFI dimension scores and SPIR scale scores by different types of faculty proved to be difficult and less than satisfactory. We believe that the lack of sufficient N in some of the cells tended to distort this data, and that the faculty type tended to mask differences in the scores. We could not, therefore, draw any meaningful conclusions about these findings.

When we compared mean faculty IFI and SPIR scores by institution, we found great differences between the faculty respondent's perceptions of their institutions. For example, Ivy College faculty respondents rated their institution considerably higher on the IFI dimensions of Intellectual-Aesthetic Extracurriculum, Freedom, Human Diversity, Concern for Improvement of Society, Democratic Governance, Concern for Advancing Knowledge, Concern for Undergraduate Learning and Institutional Esprit than did those respondents at State and Coalton. In some cases, the Ivy faculty mean scores

were as much as four points higher, on a one-to-twelve point scale, than the next highest mean institutional score. The Ivy faculty mean scores on the SPIR institutional response instrument were the most positive in all three institutions on all six of the SPIR scales. On three of these scales (Consideration, Participation in Discussion, and Student Action) the mean Ivy faculty scores were less than one point below the most positive score of three, on a scale of three as most positive to nine or fifteen as least positive. We concluded from these results that the nature of Ivy College, where free and open discussion by all members of the campus population and consensual decision-making are in effect, exerted a positive influence on faculty perceptions of the institution's functioning characteristics and on their perception of their institution's response to student pressures for change.

Analysis of the data by types of faculty and <u>within</u> institutions revealed some similarities and differences which need to be related at this point. The most startling similarities on the IFI dimensions occured between the Local-Academics and Local-Vocationals at State and at Coalton. For example, on all of the IFI dimensions, the mean Local-Academic and Local-Vocational scores at State were within five-tenths (0.5) of a point of each other. This would seem to indicate that locally-oriented faculty on that campus shared similar views of the institution regardless of their academic/vocational orientations. At Coalton College, the mean faculty IFI scores showed a larger spread between these two types of faculty. The differences there ranged from two-tenths (0.2) to one and two-tenths (1.2).

Ivy faculty consistently rated their institution most positively on all but two of the IFI dimensions, those dealing with meeting local needs and with institutional self-study and planning. The first of these is attributable to the fact that, deliberately or otherwise, Ivy has offered little to the surrounding community by way of continuing education courses or extension services. Ivy is simply not a service-oriented institution, and their faculty reflect this lack of emphasis. As for the self-study and planning dimension, the slightly lower score from Ivy faculty

may be a reflection of the fact that self-study and planning by administrators probably do not appear to be as significant on this campus as elsewhere because traditionally the entire campus population takes an active part in the actual planning process.

Faculty responses to the SPIR scales showed some surprising similarities and differences. Generally speaking, on the scale which asked the respondents to reflect upon the amount of institutional consideration that would be given to student requests for change, the responses for all types at all three institutions lay between full and some consideration. The Cosmopolitan-Academics at State and Coalton, and the Cosmopolitan-Vocationals at Coalton, were slightly less positive on this scale, perhaps as a reflection of their desire to see their institutions as freer and more open to consideration of such requests. On this scale, the Ivy faculty respondents reflected, with very positive scores, the openess of their campus.

On the SPIR scale dealing with the respondent estimates of the amount of time for action to be taken on a request for a change, we found that the Coalton College faculty differed significantly in their perceptions of their institution's response when compared with those of the other two institutions. For example, responses of the Cosmopolitan-Academics at Coalton revealed that they felt that requests for a change would be put off indefinitely or denied after a reasonable period of time. On the other hand, the Cosmopolitan-Academics at both Ivy and State shared the same more positive level of response, that is, that requests would be granted after considerable delay.

In response to the SPIR scale dealing with the estimates of the extent of student and faculty participation in the discussion of the request, the responses from Coalton faculty were the least positive, and reflected the view that such discussion would take place fully among faculty and administration with little or no participation of students. Once again, all Cosmopolitan faculty types showed the least positive scores on this scale when compared with those scores of the Local faculty types. Ivy faculty responses revealed that full participation in discussion was a strong consideration on that campus.

In the estimates of participation in the decision-making process, the Cosmopolitans dominated the least positive scores. The responses of the Cosmopolitan-Academics at State and Coalton and the Cosmopolitan-Vocationals at Coalton revealed that requests for change at these institutions would be finally decided upon by faculty and administration with minimal student opinion and no student voice. Ivy faculty responses revealed that students there would have a voice in the final decision, albeit a minor one.

On the last two SPIR scales, faculty response estimates at all three institutions revealed that, generally speaking, students could get final decisions on their requests by presenting them through their elected or appointed representatives on faculty committees. Furthermore, the responses revealed that the student leaders advocating such change could expect encouragement from individual administrators and faculty for their efforts. At State and Coalton, however, the Cosmopolitan-Academics were less optimistic about such encouragement, as were the Cosmopolitan-Vocationals at Coalton.

When these differences and similarities were considered together, we concluded that the Cosmopolitan-Academics at State and Coalton, and the Cosmopolitan-Vocationals at Coalton, generally disagreed with their locally-oriented colleagues in their perceptions of institutional functioning characteristics and their estimates of institutional response to student pressures for change. We further concluded that all of the faculty of different types at Ivy College were generally in more agreement with each other in their perceptions than were the faculties at State or Coalton. And finally, we concluded that the faculty at Coalton College were more likely to perceive their institution as being less open to student requests for change than the faculties at State or Ivy.

We had expected that faculty responses from the Advocate and Activist types of faculty (Philosophies E and F) would show respondent disenchantment with their institutions. It is significant to note that the first-choice responses to these types were very low (See Appendix II-A). On the basis of these data, we concluded that the open atmosphere at Ivy, where free discussion and a large measure of freedom are available, precluded activist faculty members from perceiving themselves as

different from their colleagues and therefore within the confines of these faculty types. We concluded that at Coalton College, where administrative rigidity and control has prevailed in the past, this attitude may have affected the responses of faculty at that institution. Finally, we concluded that the number of Advocate respondents from State was proportionately larger than from the other institutions because the Advocates at State could more easily see differences between their orientations when compared with those of their less activist-oriented colleagues. Analysis of the response frequencies to the Faculty Typology instrument, when combined across all three choices, showed that there was enough movement toward the Advocate type as a second and third choice to change its position from fifth place in first-choice analysis to third place in combined-choices analysis. This finding led us to conclude that an activist orientation among some faculty may lay only slightly below their dedication to their professional requirements. On the other hand, the analysis of this data also revealed that at all three of the institutions under study, Local-Academic types of faculty were firmly in the lead, followed closely by the Local-Vocational types of faculty at State and Coalton.

The results of the one-way analyses of variance are reported in Appendix III. Based upon the lack of statistical strength of these results, we have concluded that the independent variables of faculty type and institution, as identified in this study, were not <u>strongly</u> related to faculty perceptions of institutional functioning characteristics or of institutional responses to student pressures for change.

These findings had led us to conclude that there were positive relationships between some of the independent and dependent variables which should be mentioned at this point. We have noted a definite relationship between responses of locally-oriented faculty and certain institutional functioning characteristics. On those characteristics which called for a measure of faculty loyalty and commitment to institution, Local-Academic and Local-Vocational faculty perceived their institutions

more positively than did other types. Conversely, the Cosmopolitan-Academic and Cosmopolitan-Vocational faculty perceived their institutions less positively than did other types. These conclusions seem to suggest that an institution with a majority of locally-oriented faculty will generally be evaluated more positively by its faculty on certain IFI dimensions and SPIR scales than would an institution with a more diverse mix of faculty orientations.

In the same manner, locally-oriented faculty were more prone to perceive their institutions as being open to student requests for change and responsive to these requests than were cosmopolitan-oriented faculty. Again we believe that this was a reflection of the loyalty and institutional commitment which characterized the local faculty types, and was relatively absent in the cosmopolitan types.

The overwhelming positiveness of all Ivy faculty perceptions of that institution's functioning characteristics and responsiveness to student pressures for change, regardless of type of faculty, led us to conclude that type of faculty did not have as significant an effect on Ivy faculty responses as it did on the faculty responses at the other two institutions. At State and Coalton, the responses from cosmopolitan-oriented faculty reflected some dissatisfaction with their institution's functioning and responsiveness when compared with responses from locally-oriented faculty. The relative lack of dissatisfaction among Ivy faculty led us to conclude that the free and open climate of this institution was recognized by its faculty respondents in our sample.

In view of the fact that the institutions under study were not representative of all four-year institutions, and because the Faculty Typology and Student Perceptions of Institutional Response instruments were experimental in nature, the results of this study must be viewed as exploratory only.

In sum, the results of this study seem to suggest that the nature or style of an institution of higher education has a definite effect upon the way it responds to

student pressures for change. If an institution is characterized by its faculty as open in its methods of operation, and interested in the development of the whole student, then we believe that that institution will be more responsive to student pressures for change than an institution characterized as less open by its faculty. Furthermore, if an institution has, deliberately or otherwise, hired and retained a majority of faculty members who perceive themselves as being locally-oriented, then we suggest that that institution will be more positively supported by its faculty in efforts to meet the demands of student requests for change.

These suggestions imply that if an institution wishes to improve its relationships with its students, it should seek to improve its functioning processes with an eye toward including substantial numbers of students and faculty in the actual operation and development of goals of the institution. Further they imply that institutions seeking to minimize conflict with students over student-raised issues would be well-advised to seek and/or retain faculty who express a preference for teaching undergraduates and for participating in on-campus life, over faculty who prefer to conduct research or who have heavy off-campus consulting responsibilities.

Some suggestions for further research arising from this study can best be presented in the form of tentative research questions.

1. Do the six faculty types suggested in the Faculty Typology instrument effectively discriminate between different faculty orientations?

2. Does the Student Perceptions of Institutional Response instrument effectively identify major student-raised issues and provide adequate response possibilities?

3. Do faculty respondents from wholly different types of institutions perceive their orientations and their institutions differently?

4. Are there relationships between the demographic characteristics of faculty respondents and their perceptions of their institutions?

5. Do faculty perceptions of themselves and their institutions change longitudinally?

Each of these suggestions reflects the exploratory nature of the present study. It has, we believe, provided background for many more exacting studies pertaining to faculty perceptions of themselves and their institutions. For example, if further research and modification on the Faculty Typology instrument is done, in order to establish its psychometric properties and standardize its results, we believe that it could be a valuable instrument for institutions to use in constructing faculty orientation profiles and for comparing them with others. Further, it could be a valuable informational instrument for institutions interested in evaluating candidates for faculty positions. Further research into the properties of the Student Perceptions of Institutional Response instrument, and standardization of its results, could provide an institution with a valuable tool for assessing its response to its students' pressures for change, for identifying major areas of student concern, and hopefully for comparison with other institutions.

Studies using the same instruments employed in this study, but carefully controlled for proportionality of N's, need to be done in order to more effectively interpret significance tests. In addition to such general studies, some individual studies comparing separate faculty types in combination, and accompanied by intensive respondent interviewing, would perhaps more clearly reveal why some of the respondents reacted as they did to certain institutional dimensions and scales,and hence lead to the construction of some firm hypotheses. Studies of institutional differences, using the same intensive methods as above, would be equally illuminating.

Tables and Appendices

~~for AERA Division G,~~

~~Session 4.15, Presentation~~

"Differences in Perceived Institutional Functioning and Responsiveness to Change as Related to Faculty Types in Selected Four-Year Colleges"

C. Donald Seagren
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, Pa. 15701
April 4, 1972

Mean Faculty Institutional Functioning Inventory
Scores Arranged By Faculty Type
and By Institution

Scoring Explanation

12=Most positive
1=Least positive

TABLE 1

Mean Faculty Scores For: IFI-IAE

Institution	Faculty Type						
	A Loc-Acad	B Cos-Acad	C Loc-Voc	D Cos-Voc	E Advoc	F Activ	Total
State (A)	n=84 x=8.8	n= 8 x=6.5	n=65 x=8.7	n=12 x=8.7	n=11 x=8.0	n=2 ** x=4.0	n=182 x=8.5
Ivy (B)	n=35 x=9.7	n= 6 x=8.2	n=0 x=0*	n=0 x=0.0*	n=1** x=10.0	n=1** x=10.0	n=43 x=9.1
Coalton (C)	n=68 x=7.3	n= 9 x=5.6	n=16 x=7.5	n= 5 x=6.0	n= 3 x=7.7	n=1** x=9.0	n=102 x=7.2
Total	n=187 x=8.4	n=23 x=6.6	n=81 x=8.4	n=17 x=6.9	n=15 x=8.0	n= 4 x=6.8	n=327 x=8.2

* No responses in these cells

** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 2

Mean Faculty Scores For: IFI-F

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 x=5.9	n= 8 x=3.3	n=65 x=5.7	n=12 x=5.4	n=11 x=4.4	n=2** x=2.0	n=182 x=5.5
B	n=35 x=11.6	n= 6 x=11.5	n=0* x=0.0	n=0* x=0.0	n=1** x=12.0	n=1** x=12.0	n=43 x=11.1
C	n=68 x=6.4	n= 9 x=4.0	n=16 x=6.7	n= 5 x=5.6	n= 3 x=5.0	n=1** x=9.0	n=102 x=6.2
Total	n=187 x=7.1	n=23 x=5.7	n=81 x=5.9	n=17 x=5.5	n=15 x=5.0	n= 4 x=6.3	n=327 x=6.5

* No responses in these cells

** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 3

Mean Faculty Scores For: IFI-HD

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 x=6.1	n= 8 x=4.5	n=65 x=5.9	n=12 x=6.1	n=11 x=5.0	n=2** x=2.0	n=182 x=5.9
B	n=35 x=9.1	n= 6 x=6.7	n=0* x=0.0	n=0* x=0.0	n=1** x=10.0	n=1** x=9.0	n=43 x=8.4
C	n=68 x=5.9	n= 9 x=4.3	n=16 x=6.6	n= 5 x=4.6	n= 3 x=6.3	n=1** x=7.0	n=102 x=5.8
Total	n=187 x=6.6	n=23 x=5.0	n=81 x=6.0	n-17 x=5.4	n=15 x=5.6	n= 4 x=5.0	n=327 x=6.2

* No responses in these cells

** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 4

Mean Faculty Scores For: IFI-UL

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 x=6.7	n= 8 x=4.9	n=65 x=6.5	n=12 x=6.4	n=11 x=5.3	n=2** x=3.5	n=182 x=6.4
B	n=35 x=10.4	n= 8 x=9.7	n=0* x=0.0	n=0* x=0.0	n=1** x=10.0	n=1** x=12.0	n=43 x=9.9
C	n=68 x=7.9	n= 9 x=7.2	n=16 x=8.6	n= 5 x=5.4	n= 3 x=7.3	n=1** x=8.0	n=102 x=7.8
Total	n=187 x=7.8	n=23 x=7.0	n=81 x=6.9	n=17 x=5.8	n=15 x=6.0	n= 4 x=6.8	n=327 x=7.3

* No responses in these cells

** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 5

Mean Faculty Scores for: IFI-IS

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 x=3.8	n= 8 x=1.5	n=65 x=4.2	n=12 x=4.4	n=11 x=3.1	n=2** x=2.0	n=182 x=3.8
B	n=35 x=8.3	n= 6 x=5.3	n=0* x=0.0	n=0* x=0.0	n=1** x=8.0	n=1** x=8.0	n=43 x=7.6
C	n=68 x=6.3	n= 9 x=3.4	n=16 x=6.4	n= 5 x=4.6	n= 3 x=5.3	n=1** x=7.0	n=102 x=5.9
Total	n=187 x=5.5	n=23 x=3.3	n=81 x=4.6	n=17 x=4.3	n=15 x=3.9	n= 4 x=48	n=327 x=5.0

* No responses in these cells

** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 6

Mean Faculty Scores For: IFI-DG

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 x̄=6.7	n= 8 x̄=1.5	n=65 x̄=6.5	n=12 x̄=5.2	n=11 x̄=4.5	n=2** x̄=2.5	n=182 x̄=6.1
B	n=35 x̄=10.6	n= 6 x̄=8.8	n=0* x̄=0.0	n=0* x̄=0.0	n=1** x̄=12.0	n=1** x̄=12.0	n=43 x̄=9.9
C	n=68 x̄=6.5	n= 9 x̄=5.4	n=16 x̄=7.7	n= 5 x̄=2.8	n= 3 x̄=7.3	n=1** x̄=6.0	n=102 x̄=6.4
Total	n=187 x̄=7.3	n=23 x̄=4.9	n=81 x̄=6.7	n=17 x̄=4.3	n=15 x̄=5.6	n= 4 x̄=5.8	n=327 x̄=6.7

* No responses in these cells

** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 7

Mean Faculty Scores For: IFI-MIN

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 x̄=6.6	n= 8 x̄=4.8	n=65 x̄=6.9	n=12 x̄=7.6	n=11 x̄=5.9	n=2** x̄=3.5	n=182 x̄=6.6
B	n=35 x̄=2.2	n= 6 x̄=1.5	n=0* x̄=0.0	n=0* x̄=0.0	n=1** x̄=2.0	n=1** x̄=3.0	n=43 x̄=2.1
C	n=68 x̄=9.4	n= 9 x̄=7.7	n=16 x̄=10.1	n= 5 x̄=8.2	n= 3 x̄=8.0	n=1** x̄=9.0	n=102 x̄=9.2
Total	n=187 x̄=6.8	n=23 x̄=5.0	n=81 x̄=7.5	n=17 x̄=7.3	n=15 x̄=6.0	n= 4 x̄=4.8	n=327 x̄=6.8

* No responses in these cells

** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 8

Mean Faculty Scores For: IFI-SP

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=82 x̄=7.3	n= 8 x̄=4.0	n=65 x̄=7.4	n=12 x̄=7.0	n=11 x̄=5.5	n=2** x̄=4.0	n=182 x̄=7.0
B	n=35 x̄=6.6	n= 6 x̄=4.2	n=0* x̄=0.0	n=0* x̄=0.0	n=1** x̄=7.0	n=1** x̄=7.0	n=43 x̄=6.0
C	n=68 x̄=7.6	n= 9 x̄=5.8	n=16 x̄=8.2	n= 5 x̄=4.6	n= 3 x̄=6.7	n=1** x̄=8.0	n=102 x̄=7.4
Total	n=187 x̄=7.3	n=23 x̄=4.7	n=81 x̄=7.5	n=17 x̄=6.0	n=15 x̄=5.8	n= 4 x̄=5.8	n=327 x̄=6.9

* No responses in these cells

** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 9

Mean Faculty Scores For: IFI-AK

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 x=3.6	n= 8 x=1.5	n=65 x=3.9	n=12 x=3.6	n=11 x=3.0	n=2** x=3.0	n=182 x=3.5
B	n=35 x=6.8	n= 6 x=5.8	n=0* x=0.0	n=0* x=0.0	n=1** x=9.0	n=1** x=9.0	n=45 x=6.5
C	n=68 x=4.3	n= 9 x=3.3	n=16 x=5.1	n= 5 x=3.2	n= 3 x=5.3	n=1** x=5.0	n=102 x=4.3
Total	n=187 x=4.4	n=23 x=3.3	n=81 x=4.1	n=17 x=3.3	n=15 x=3.9	n= 4 x=5.0	n=327 x=4.2

* No responses in these cells

** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 10

Mean Faculty Scores For: IFI-CI

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 x=7.3	n= 8 x=3.1	n=65 x=6.8	n=12 x=6.8	n=11 x=5.6	n=2** x=1.5	n=182 x=6.7
B	n=35 x=9.6	n= 6 x=7.7	n=0* x=0.0	n=0* x=0.0	n=1** x=11.0	n=1** x=10.0	n=43 x=9.0
C	n=68 x=7.3	n= 9 x=4.9	n=16 x=8.2	n= 5 x=5.0	n= 3 x=7.3	n=1** x=11.0	n=102 x=7.1
Total	n=187 x=7.7	n=23 x=5.0	n=81 x=7.0	n=17 x=6.0	n=15 x=6.3	n= 4 x=6.0	n=327 x=7.2

* No responses in these cells

** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 11

Mean Faculty Scores For: IFI-IE

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 x=7.8	n= 8 x=4.1	n=65 x=8.1	n=12 x=8.1	n=11 x=6.7	n=2** x=4.0	n=182 x=7.7
B	n=35 x=10.4	n= 6 x=10.8	n=0* x=0.0	n=0* x=0.0	n=1** x=12.0	n=1** x=9.0	n=43 x=10.0
C	n=68 x=9.1	n= 9 x=7.1	n=16 x=10.2	n= 5 x=8.0	n= 3 x=8.0	n=1** x=12.0	n=102 x=9.1
Total	n=187 x=8.8	n=23 x=7.0	n=81 x=8.4	n=17 x=7.7	n=15 x=7.3	n= 4 x=7.3	n=327 x=8.4

* No responses in these cells

** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

Mean Faculty Student Perceptions of Institutional Response Scores Arranged By Faculty Type and By Institution

Scoring Explanation
3=Most positive
9=least positive(Scale Consid)
15=least positive(Other Scale)

TABLE 12

Mean Faculty Scores For: SPIR-CONSID

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 x̄=4.6	n= 8 x̄=5.5	n=65 x̄=4.7	n=12 x̄=4.8	n=11 x̄=5.4	n=2** x̄=5.0	n=182 x̄=4.7
B	n=35 x̄=3.2	n= 6 x̄=3.3	n=0* x̄=0.0	n=0* x̄=0.0	n=1** x̄=4.0	n=1** x̄=3.0	n=43 x̄=3.2
C	n=68 x̄=4.6	n= 9 x̄=5.0	n=16 x̄=4.4	n= 5 x̄=6.0	n= 3 x̄=4.3	n=1** x̄=4.0	n=102 x̄=4.7
Total	n=187 x̄=4.4	n=23 x̄=4.7	n=81 x̄=4.6	n=17 x̄=5.1	n=15 x̄=5.1	n= 4 x̄=4.3	n=327 x̄=4.5

* No responses in these cells

** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 13

Mean Faculty Scores For: SPIR-TIME

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 x̄=6.5	n= 8 x̄=5.5	n=65 x̄=6.8	n=12 x̄=6.8	n=11 x̄=6.6	n=2** x̄=4.5	n=182 x̄=6.6
B	n=35 x̄=5.3	n= 6 x̄=5.5	n=0* x̄=0.0	n=0* x̄=0.0	n=1** x̄=7.0	n=1** x̄=6.0	n=43 x̄=5.2
C	n=68 x̄=8.1	n= 9 x̄=9.9	n=16 x̄=7.9	n= 5 x̄=8.0	n= 3 x̄=8.3	n=1** x̄=3.0	n=102 x̄=8.2
Total	n=187 x̄=6.8	n=23 x̄=7.2	n=81 x̄=6.9	n=17 x̄=6.9	n=15 x̄=7.0	n= 4 x̄=4.5	n=327 x̄=6.9

* No responses in these cells

** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 14

Mean Faculty Scores For: SPIR-PRTDIS

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 $\bar{x}$=5.1	n= 8 $\bar{x}$=8.5	n=65 $\bar{x}$=5.6	n=12 $\bar{x}$=6.3	n=11 $\bar{x}$=5.7	n=2** $\bar{x}$=7.5	n=182 $\bar{x}$=5.6
B	n=35 $\bar{x}$=3.4	n= 6 $\bar{x}$=4.0	n=0* $\bar{x}$=0.0	n=0* $\bar{x}$=0.0	n=1** $\bar{x}$=5.0	n=1** $\bar{x}$=4.0	n=43 $\bar{x}$=3.5
C	n=68 $\bar{x}$=6.0	n= 9 $\bar{x}$=7.6	n=16 $\bar{x}$=5.9	n= 5 $\bar{x}$=8.6	n= 3 $\bar{x}$=7.3	n=1** $\bar{x}$=3.0	n=102 $\bar{x}$=6.3
Total	n=187 $\bar{x}$=5.1	n=23 $\bar{x}$=6.9	n=81 $\bar{x}$=5.6	n=17 $\bar{x}$=6.8	n=15 $\bar{x}$=6.0	n= 4 $\bar{x}$=5.5	n=327 $\bar{x}$=5.5

* No responses in these cells ** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 15

Mean Faculty Scores For: SPIR-PRTDCM

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 $\bar{x}$=6.5	n= 8 $\bar{x}$=9.3	n=65 $\bar{x}$=6.9	n=12 $\bar{x}$=6.9	n=11 $\bar{x}$=7.1	n=2** $\bar{x}$=8.0	n=182 $\bar{x}$=6.8
B	n=35 $\bar{x}$=5.9	n= 6 $\bar{x}$=6.3	n=0* $\bar{x}$=0.0	n=0* $\bar{x}$=0.0	n=1** $\bar{x}$=7.0	n=1** $\bar{x}$=7.0	n=43 $\bar{x}$=5.9
C	n=68 $\bar{x}$=8.1	n= 9 $\bar{x}$=9.6	n=16 $\bar{x}$=7.4	n= 5 $\bar{x}$=10.8	n= 3 $\bar{x}$=8.3	n=1** $\bar{x}$=3.0	n=102 $\bar{x}$=8.2
Total	n=187 $\bar{x}$=6.9	n=23 $\bar{x}$=8.6	n=81 $\bar{x}$=6.9	n=17 $\bar{x}$=7.8	n=15 $\bar{x}$=7.3	n= 4 $\bar{x}$=6.5	n=327 $\bar{x}$=7.1

* No responses in these cells ** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 16

Mean Faculty Scores For: SPIR-STDACT

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 $\bar{x}$=4.4	n= 8 $\bar{x}$=4.8	n=65 $\bar{x}$=4.6	n=12 $\bar{x}$=4.7	n=11 $\bar{x}$=5.2	n=2** $\bar{x}$=8.0	n=182 $\bar{x}$=4.6
B	n=35 $\bar{x}$=3.4	n= 6 $\bar{x}$=4.3	n=0* $\bar{x}$=0.0	n=0* $\bar{x}$=0.0	n=1** $\bar{x}$=5.0	n=1** $\bar{x}$=3.0	n=43 $\bar{x}$=3.6
C	n=68 $\bar{x}$=5.6	n= 9 $\bar{x}$=5.4	n=16 $\bar{x}$=5.1	n= 5 $\bar{x}$=4.8	n= 3 $\bar{x}$=5.7	n=1** $\bar{x}$=3.0	n=102 $\bar{x}$=5.4
Total	n=187 $\bar{x}$=4.7	n=23 $\bar{x}$=4.9	n=81 $\bar{x}$=4.7	n=17 $\bar{x}$=4.6	n=15 $\bar{x}$=5.3	n= 4 $\bar{x}$=5.5	n=327 $\bar{x}$=4.7

* No responses in these cells ** cells with an n of less than 3 will not be utilized in the analyses

TABLE 17

Mean Faculty Scores For: SPIR-CONQST

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A	n=84 x̄=5.8	n= 8 x̄=7.1	n=65 x̄=6.2	n=12 x̄=5.3	n=11 x̄=6.4	n=2** x̄=8.0	n=182 x̄=6.0
B	n=35 x̄=4.2	n= 6 x̄=5.8	n=0* x̄=0.0	n=0* x̄=0.0	n=1** x̄=7.0	n=1** x̄=6.0	n=43 x̄=4.5
C	n=68 x̄=6.4	n= 9 x̄=6.7	n=16 x̄=6.3	n= 5 x̄=7.2	n= 3 x̄=6.0	n=1** x̄=3.0	n=102 x̄=6.4
Total	n=187 x̄=5.7	n=23 x̄=6.6	n=81 x̄=6.2	n=17 x̄=5.7	n=15 x̄=6.3	n= 4 x̄=6.3	n=327 x̄=5.9

Appendix I

Response Frequencies and Percentages of Total Responses of Faculty by Institution on Demographic Items

Demographic Item	Institution							
	State		Ivy		Coalton		TOTAL	
	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1. Respondents' Colleges	182	(55.7)	43	(13.1)	102	(31.2)	327	(100.0)
2. Respondents' Primary Work Activity								
A. Teaching	132	(74.6)	41	(95.3)	75	(73.5)	248	(75.8)
B. Non-Teaching	45	(24.7)	2	(4.7)	24	(23.5)	71	(21.7)
C. Missing	5	(2.7)	--	---	3	(2.9)	8	(2.4)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)
3. % of Respondents' Work Activity Spent with Students								
A. Less than 50%	47	(25.8)	19	(44.2)	31	(30.4)	97	(29.7)
B. 50 to 75 %	49	(26.9)	16	(37.2)	22	(21.6)	87	(26.6)
C. More than 75%	80	(44.0)	7	(16.3)	47	(46.1)	134	(41.0)
D. Missing	6	(3.3)	1	(2.3)	2	(2.0)	9	(2.8)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)
4. Respondents' Major Fields of Teaching and/or Research Interest								
A. Science	37	(20.3)	15	(34.9)	24	(23.5)	76	(23.2)
B. Social Science	40	(22.0)	9	(20.9)	10	(9.8)	59	(18.0)
C. Human-Fine Arts	41	(22.5)	17	(39.5)	30	(29.4)	88	(26.9)
D. Education	38	(20.9)	--	----	9	(8.8)	47	(14.4)
E. Business	7	(3.8)	--	----	11	(10.8)	18	(5.5)
F. Others	6	(3.3)	--	----	7	(6.9)	13	(4.0)
G. Missing	13	(7.1)	2	(4.7)	11	(10.8)	26	(8.0)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)

5. Academic Rank of Respondents								
A. Instructor or Asst. Prof.	54	(29.7)	17	(39.5)	53	(52.0)	124	(37.9)
B. Associate Prof.	79	(43.4)	6	(14.0)	17	(16.7)	102	(31.2)
C. Professor	46	(25.3)	18	(41.9)	16	(15.7)	80	(24.5)
D. Other	--	----	2	(4.7)	13	(12.7)	15	(4.6)
E. Missing	13	(1.6)	--	----	3	(2.9)	6	(1.8)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)
6. Tenure Statuses of Respondents								
A. Tenured	109	(59.9)	20	(46.5)	47	(46.1)	176	(53.8)
B. Non-Tenured	60	(33.0)	23	(53.5)	40	(39.2)	123	(37.6)
C. Not Applicable	10	(5.5)	--	----	12	(11.8)	22	(6.7)
D. Missing	3	(1.6)	--	----	3	(2.9)	6	(1.8)
Total	182	(100.0)	42	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)
7. Respondents Who are Department Heads								
A. Yes	24	(13.2)	14	(32.6)	12	(11.8)	50	(15.3)
B. No	151	(83.0)	29	(67.4)	85	(83.3)	265	(81.0)
C. Missing	7	(3.8)	--	----	5	(4.9)	12	(3.7)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)
8. Respondents' Highest Degrees Earned								
A. Less than Doctorate	112	(61.5)	7	(16.3)	61	(59.8)	180	(55.0)
B. Doctorate	65	(35.7)	35	(81.4)	37	(36.3)	137	(41.9)
C. Other	---	----	1	(2.3)	--	----	1	(0.3)
D. Missing	5	(2.7)	--	----	4	(3.9)	9	(2.8)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)
9. Respondents' Age Ranges								
A. Under 31	27	(14.8)	10	(23.3)	18	(17.6)	55	(16.8)
B. 31 to 40	58	(31.9)	17	(39.5)	33	(32.4)	108	(33.0)
C. 41 to 50	52	(28.6)	9	(20.9)	23	(22.5)	84	(25.7)
D. over 50	38	(20.9)	7	(16.3)	25	(24.5)	70	(21.4)
E. Missing	7	(3.8)	--	----	3	(2.9)	10	(3.1)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)

10. Respondents' Sex								
A. Male	146	(80.2)	40	(93.0)	79	(77.5)	265	(81.0)
B. Female	25	(13.8)	3	(7.0)	19	(18.6)	47	(14.4)
C. Missing	11	(6.0)	--	----	4	(3.9)	15	(4.6)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)
11. Respondents' Full-Time Employment Records at different Colleges or Universities								
A. Employed at none	13	(7.1)	2	(4.7)	12	(11.8)	27	(8.3)
B. Employed at one	60	(33.0)	16	(37.2)	50	(49.0)	126	(38.5)
C. Employed at two	52	(28.6)	17	(39.5)	19	(18.6)	88	(26.9)
D. Employed at three or more	49	(26.9)	8	(18.6)	18	(17.6)	75	(22.9)
E. Missing	8	(4.4)	--	----	3	(2.9)	11	(3.4)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)
12. Respondents' Total Length of Employment in Colleges or Universities								
A. Less than 3 years	27	(14.8)	8	(18.6)	21	(20.6)	56	(17.1)
B. 4 through 6 years	36	(19.8)	10	(23.3)	18	(17.6)	64	(19.6)
C. 7 through 9 years	34	(18.7)	5	(11.6)	18	(17.6)	57	(17.4)
D. 10 through 14 years	36	(19.8)	8	(18.6)	11	(10.8)	55	(16.8)
E. 15 through 19 years	20	(11.0)	6	(14.0)	9	(8.8)	35	(10.7)
F. 20 years or more	21	(11.5)	5	(11.6)	20	(19.6)	46	(14.1)
G. Missing	8	(4.4)	1	(2.3)	5	(4.9)	14	(4.3)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)

13. Respondents' Length of Time at Present College								
A. one year or less	11	(6.0)	7	(16.3)	17	(16.7)	35	(10.7)
B. 2 thru 3 years	54	(29.7)	8	(18.6)	18	(17.6)	80	(24.5)
C. 4 thru 6 years	47	(25.8)	8	(18.6)	16	(15.7)	71	(21.7)
D. 7 thru 9 years	24	(13.2)	2	(4.7)	13	(12.7)	39	(11.9)
E. 10 thru 14 years	26	(14.3)	7	(16.3)	12	(11.8)	45	(13.8)
F. 15 years or more	14	(7.7)	10	(23.3)	22	(21.6)	46	(14.1)
G. Missing	6	(3.3)	1	(2.3)	4	(3.9)	11	(3.4)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)
14. Description of Communities in which Respondents Crew Up								
A. Large City	32	(17.6)	13	(30.2)	28	(27.5)	73	(22.3)
B. Medium City	18	(9.9)	11	(25.6)	28	(27.5)	57	(17.4)
C. Small City-Suburb	42	(23.1)	8	(18.6)	16	(15.7)	66	(20.2)
D. Small City-Non Suburb	49	(26.9)	6	(14.0)	21	(20.6)	76	(23.2)
E. Farm or Village	37	(20.3)	4	(9.3)	8	(7.8)	49	(15.0)
F. Missing	4	(2.2)	1	(2.3)	1	(1.0)	6	(1.8)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)
15. Educational Level of Respondents' Fathers								
A. Grade School	51	(28.0)	8	(18.6)	33	(32.4)	92	(28.1)
B. Some High School	27	(14.8)	8	(18.6)	8	(7.8)	43	(13.1)
C. Finished High School	37	(20.3)	1	(2.3)	21	(20.6)	59	(18.0)
D. Some College	27	(14.8)	3	(7.0)	13	(12.7)	43	(13.1)
E. Finished College or Beyond	34	(18.7)	23	(53.5)	25	(24.5)	82	(25.1)
F. Missing	6	(3.3)	--	----	2	(2.0)	8	(2.4)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)

16. Occupation of Respondents' Fathers								
A. Manager-Executive Small Business Owner	58	(31.9)	8	(18.6)	30	(29.4)	96	(29.4)
B. Semi-or Unskilled Workers	31	(17.0)	2	(4.7)	19	(18.6)	52	(15.9)
C. Skilled worker	36	(19.8)	4	(9.3)	20	(19.6)	60	(18.3)
D. Clerical of Sales	19	(10.4)	8	(18.6)	7	(6.9)	34	(10.4)
E. Professional	30	(16.5)	19	(44.2)	24	(23.5)	73	(22.3)
F. Missing	8	(4.4)	2	(4.7)	2	(2.0)	12	(3.7)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)
17. Respondents' Descriptions of Political Orientations								
A. Conservative	57	(31.3)	6	(14.0)	27	(26.5)	90	(27.5)
B. Middle of the Road	63	(34.6)	5	(11.6)	33	(32.4)	101	(30.9)
C. Liberal	53	(29.1)	25	(58.1)	38	(37.3)	116	(35.5)
D. Left	4	(2.2)	6	(14.0)	3	(2.9)	13	(4.0)
E. Missing	5	(2.7)	1	(2.3)	1	(1.0)	7	(2.1)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)
18. Respondents' Religious Preferences								
A. Protestant	101	(55.5)	15	(34.9)	40	(39.2)	156	(47.7)
B. Catholic	32	(17.6)	4	(9.3)	23	(22.5)	59	(18.0)
C. Jewish and Other	10	(5.5)	10	(23.3)	16	(15.7)	36	(11.0)
D. None	18	(9.9)	8	(18.6)	10	(9.8)	36	(11.0)
E. Prefer not to answer	15	(8.2)	5	(11.6)	11	(10.8)	31	(9.5)
F. Missing	6	(3.3)	1	(2.3)	2	(2.0)	9	(2.8)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)
19. Respondents' Racial Identities								
A. White	166	(91.2)	40	(93.0)	96	(94.1)	302	(92.4)
B. Black, Oriental or Other	1	(0.5)	--	----	--	----	1	(0.3)
C. Prefer not to answer	11	(6.0)	1	(2.3)	5	(4.9)	17	(5.2)
D. Missing	4	(2.2)	2	(4.7)	1	(1.0)	7	(2.1)
Total	182	(100.0)	43	(100.0)	102	(100.0)	327	(100.0)

APPENDIX II

A. First Choice Faculty Typology

Response Frequencies and

Percentages, by Institution

Faculty Type	Institution							
	State		Ivy		Coalton		Total	
	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Local Academic A	84	(46)	35	(81)	68	(67)	187	(57)
Cosmopolitan Academic B	8	(4)	6	(14)	9	(9)	23	(7)
Local Vocational C	65	(36)	0	--	16	(16)	81	(25)
Cosmopolitan Vocational D	12	(7)	0	--	5	(5)	17	(5)
Advocate E	11	(6)	1	(2)	3	(3)	15	(5)
Activist F	2	(1)	1	(2)	1	(1)	4	(1)
Total	182	(100)	43	(100)	102	(100)	327	(100)

B. Combined First, Second and Third Choice

Faculty Typology Frequencies* and Percentages by Institution

A	47	(29)	13	(37)	32	(33)	92	(32)
B	18	(11)	6	(17)	12	(12)	36	(12)
C	46	(29)	4	(11)	22	(22)	72	(25)
D	22	(14)	0.7	(2)	14	(14)	33	(11)
E	19	(12)	7	(20)	12	(12)	38	(13)
F	9	(6)	4+	(11)	6	(6)	20	(7)

* Computed by adding together the total N of first, second and third choices for the type and dividing the resulting sum by 3.

C. Faculty Respondents' Percentage Estimates

of the Faculty Philosophies Held by their Faculty Colleagues,

as Related to Faculty Types on the Faculty Typology Instrument

Faculty Estimates at	Faculty Types						
	Loc Acad A	Cosm Acad B	Loc Voc C	Cos Voc D	Advocate E	Activist F	Total
State	34.8	7.9	35.2	9.7	8.5	4.6	100.0
Ivy	49.8	18.6	6.7	5.4	11.9	7.1	100.0
Coalton	43.0	12.6	26.6	8.1	7.4	4.5	100.0
Average %	39.2	10.7	28.9	8.7	8.7	4.9	100.0

D. Faculty Respondents' Percentage Estimates

of the Orientations Held by Students at Their Institutions,

as Related to Student Types on the Peterson 8-Way Typology*

Faculty Estimates at	Student Types								
	Prof. A	Coll. B	Acad. C	Intell. D	Voc. E	Rad. F.	Hip. G.	Rit. H	Total
State	17.6	15.6	4.9	6.2	36.3	3.4	2.8	14.1	100.0
Ivy	25.8	15.7	15.3	14.6	1.5	7.9	7.1	11.8	100.0
Coalton	21.1	19.5	7.7	6.5	29.9	3.8	2.4	14.1	100.0
Average %	19.7	16.9	6.9	7.2	30.3	4.0	3.1	13.8	100.0

* See companion papers by Quatroche and by Richard

APPENDIX III

Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance

All total Sums of Squares were corrected by the application of Bartlett's Test for Homegeneity of Variance. Those data which did not support this test's hypotheses of equal population variance are so noted with a question mark(?) in the Fratio cell.

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Fratio	Significance	est. ω^2
Faculty Type	IFI-IAE	3.663	p >.01	.039
	IFI-F	3.171	p >.01	.032
	IFI-HD	2.389	p >.05	.050
	IFI-UL	2.894	p >.05	.023
	IFI-IS	3.533	p >.01	.037
	IFI-DG	3.182	p >.01	.032
	IFI-MLN	3.633	p >.01	.038
	IFI-SP	4.530	p >.01	.051
	IFI-AK	1.772(?)	NS	.011
	IFI-CI	3.581	p >.01	.037
	IFI-IE	1.607	NS	.009
Institution	IFI-IAE	19.864(?)	p >.01	.103
	IFI-F	89.923(?)	p >.01	.352
	IFI-HD	26.387	p >.01	.134
	IFI-UL	42.333(?)	p >.01	.201
	IFI-IS	50.527	p >.01	.232
	IFI-DG	23.148(?)	p >.01	.119
	IFI-MLN	170.771(?)	p >.01	.509
	IFI-SP	2.081	NS	.006
	IFI-AK	49.405	p >.01	.228
	IFI-CI	11.524	p >.01	.060
	IFI-IE	14.629(?)	p >.01	.076
Faculty Type	SPIR-CONSID	2.027	NS	.015
	SPIR-TIME	0.563	NS	0
	SPIR-PRTDIS	3.202	p >.01	.032
	SPIR-PRTDCM	1.881	NS	.013
	SPIR-STDACT	0.289	NS	0
	SPIR-CONQST	0.955	NS	0
Institution	SPIR-CONSID	23.320(?)	p >.01	.120
	SPIR-TIME	15.345	p >.01	.080
	SPIR-PRTDIS	16.606(?)	p >.01	.087
	SPIR-PRTDCM	12.855(?)	p >.01	.067
	SPIR-STDACT	9.755(?)	p >.01	.050
	SPIR-CONQST	8.409(?)	p >.01	.043